



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,556	09/05/2006	Thomas Zeng	134188WOUS	7224
24587	7590	10/16/2008		
ALCATEL LUCENT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS 3400 W. PLANO PARKWAY, MS LEGL2 PLANO, TX 75075			EXAMINER DUBASKY, GIGI L.	
			ART UNIT 2421	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/16/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/598,556

**Applicant(s)**

ZENG ET AL.

**Examiner**

GIGI DUBASKY

**Art Unit**

4126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2006.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 6-10, 14-18 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deshpande (US 2005/0071881).

Regarding claim 1, Deshpande discloses a method for retrieving digital multimedia content from a network node, comprising:  
generating a message to said network node by a client application executing on a digital multimedia device, said message containing at least one of a multidimensional pointer to a depository of digital multimedia content associated with said network node (paragraph [0021], lines 6-9, paragraph [0025], lines 6-13, paragraph [0053], lines 11-14 and paragraph [0074], but not limited to. Examiner interpreted "generating display instructions" as generating messages. Deshpande teaches a "playlist", which includes information about a number of individual media files (paragraph [0004], lines 1-5), having equal functional manner as a multidimensional pointer to a depository of digital multimedia content, because each playlist has segments from different videos which are

stored on different servers (paragraph [0049], lines 1-9)) and a timing parameter operable to indicate when said message is to take effect (paragraph [0075], lines 8-10); and transferring digital multimedia content to said digital multimedia device by said network node from a particular content source identified by said multidimensional pointer (see Figure 1; paragraph [0046], lines 1-4, step 1310 in Figure 13, but not limited to), said transferring commencing at a time indicated responsive to said timing parameter (paragraph [0102], paragraph [0104], lines 4-8, paragraph [0105]-[0108], but not limited to. Transfer data in real time also meets the claimed limitation).

Regarding claim 2, Deshpande discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Deshpande further discloses the message generated by said client application comprises a Real-Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP)-compliant PLAYLIST\_PLAY message that includes said multidimensional pointer in a range header of said message (paragraph [0025], paragraph [0035], paragraph [0048], lines 7-10 and paragraph [0105]-[0108], but not limited to).

Regarding claim 6, Deshpande discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Deshpande further discloses the digital multimedia device accesses said network node over at least one of a wire line network, a wireless network, and a cable network (paragraph [0046], lines 4-16, but not limited to).

Regarding claim 7, Deshpande discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Deshpande further discloses digital multimedia device comprises at least one of: digital music players, digital video players, computers and handheld communication devices enabled to accept streaming media (see Figure 14; paragraph [0005], lines 4-9, paragraph [0114]-[0117], but not limited to).

Regarding claim 8, Deshpande discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Deshpande further discloses said timing parameter is used to identify when said message is to be satisfied by said network node and is operable to assume a value selected from the group consisting of: NOW (paragraph [0102], lines 1-4, paragraph [0105]-[0108]. Request to play in real-time from clients meets the claimed limitation of "a value of timing parameter is NOW"), END OF CLIP (paragraph [0076], lines 5-10, and paragraph [0104], lines 6-10, but not limited to).

Regarding claim 9, all limitations of claimed system in claim 9 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 1. So claim 9 is rejected on the same ground as claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, all limitations of claimed system in claim 10 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 2. So claim 10 is rejected on the same ground as claim 2.

Regarding claim 14, all limitations of claimed system in claim 14 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 6. So claim 14 is rejected on the same ground as claim 6.

Regarding claim 15, all limitations of claimed system in claim 15 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 7. So claim 15 is rejected on the same ground as claim 7.

Regarding claim 16, all limitations of claimed system in claim 16 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 8. So claim 16 is rejected on the same ground as claim 8.

Regarding claim 17, Deshpande discloses a digital multimedia device which all functionalities are analyzed and rejected corresponding to the discussion in the rejection of claim 1. Deshpande further discloses a logic for generating a message (paragraph [0113]-[0114]) and a player engine (element 106 in Figure 1 or element 220 in Figure 2 or elements 1414 and 1416 in Figure 14).

Regarding claim 18, Deshpande discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. The limitations of claim 18 are analyzed and rejected corresponding to the discussion in the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 23, Deshpande discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. The limitations of claim 23 are analyzed and rejected corresponding to the discussion in the rejection of claim 6.

Regarding claim 24, Deshpande discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. The limitations of claim 24 are analyzed and rejected corresponding to the discussion in the rejection of claim 8.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-5, 11-13 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deshpande (US 2005/0071881) in view of Tao et al (US 6441832).

Regarding claim 3, Deshpande discloses all the limitations of the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Deshpande further discloses there are several sources for media data and several servers (see Figure 1; paragraph [0045], lines 3-5 and paragraph [0046], lines 1-4, but not limited to).

Deshpande does not explicitly disclose the limitation of "depository of digital multimedia content is organized into a nested hierarchical arrangement having a

plurality of levels that correspond to respective media identifier dimensions of said multidimensional pointer”.

Tao discloses the limitation of “depository of digital multimedia content is organized into a nested hierarchical arrangement having a plurality of levels that correspond to respective media identifier dimensions of said multidimensional pointer” (abstract, see Figure 10-16, Col 1, lines 44-58, but not limited to).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Deshpande’s system with the teaching of Tao, so to provide readily and organized performance of editing and displaying playlists.

Regarding claim 4, Deshpande in view of Tao discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 3. Deshpande (paragraph [0003], lines 4-8, paragraph [0027], lines 5-6, paragraph [0049], lines 10-16, but not limited to) in view of Tao further discloses a first level of said depository of digital multimedia content comprises at least one server-side playlist identified by a uniform resource locator.

Regarding claim 5, Deshpande in view of Tao discloses the method as discussed in the rejection of claim 4. Deshpande in view of Tao (see Figure 12-15; Col 10, lines 54-67 and Col 15, lines 52-56, but not limited to) further discloses at least one server-side playlist includes one or more media clips, each being identified by a corresponding media source identifier and a relative time offset within said media clip.



Regarding claim 11, all limitations of claimed system in claim 11 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 3. So claim 11 is rejected on the same ground as claim 3.

Regarding claim 12, all limitations of claimed system in claim 12 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 4. So claim 12 is rejected on the same ground as claim 4.

Regarding claim 13, all limitations of claimed system in claim 13 are analyzed corresponding to the functionalities of claim 5. So claim 13 is rejected on the same ground as claim 5.

Regarding claim 19, Deshpande discloses all the limitations of the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. Deshpande further discloses there are several sources for media data and several servers (see Figure 1; paragraph [0045], lines 3-5 and paragraph [0046], lines 1-4, but not limited to).

Deshpande does not explicitly disclose the limitation of "the multidimensional pointer includes a plurality of media identifier dimensions that correspond to a plurality of nested hierarchical levels into which said depository of digital multimedia content is organized".

Tao discloses the limitation of "the multidimensional pointer includes a plurality of media identifier dimensions that correspond to a plurality of nested hierarchical levels

into which said depository of digital multimedia content is organized" (abstract, see Figure 10-16, Col 1, lines 44-58, but not limited to).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Deshpande's system with the teaching of Tao, so to provide readily and organized performance of editing and displaying playlists.

Regarding claim 20, Deshpande in view of Tao discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 19. Deshpande (paragraph [0003], lines 4-8, paragraph [0027], lines 5-6, paragraph [0049], lines 10-16, but not limited to) in view of Tao further discloses a first level of said plurality of media identifier dimensions comprises a uniform resource locator identifying a server-side playlist.

Regarding claim 21, Deshpande in view of Tao discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 20. Deshpande in view of Tao (see Figure 11-12. Examiner interpreted Figure 11 as the first level of the plurality of media identifier dimensions because it includes all the playlist identifiers and Figure 12 as the second level which includes plurality of clip identifiers) further discloses a second level of said plurality of media identifier dimensions comprises at least one of a media source identifier for identifying a particular media clip within said server-side playlist.

Regarding claim 22, Deshpande in view of Tao discloses the device as discussed in the rejection of claim 21. Deshpande in view of Tao (see Figure 12-15; Col

10, lines 54-67 and Col 15, lines 52-56, but not limited to) further discloses the multidimensional pointer includes a relative time offset within said particular media clip.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Elliott (US 7277955) teaches the streaming content.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GIGI DUBASKY whose telephone number is (571)270-5686. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 5:00pm with alternative Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Beliveau can be reached on 571-272-7343. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason P Salce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

10/10/2008

GD